

while another storage and a display are coupled to the other processor-based system for automatically enabling the display of information that is automatically transferred. Therefore, as claimed in claim 1, for automatic transfer and subsequent automatic display of time sensitive data, the source storage coupled to the first processor-based system while the destination storage along with the display coupled to the second processor-based system is not taught let alone suggested by *Tsukakoshi*.

Specifically, the *Tsukakoshi* reference does not disclose automatic display of the time sensitive data which is automatically transferred from a source storage to a destination storage between two processor-based systems each coupled to the respective storage, and one of the two processor-based systems also coupled to a display, as claimed in claim 1. *Tsukakoshi* in order to transmit data after the data becomes available for transmission, i.e., before initiating the actual transfer of data, takes into consideration the difference between memory capacities of the two processing units. If this difference is such that transmission cannot occur, the transfer of the data is denied regardless of the nature of the data. Accordingly, *Tsukakoshi*, as intended by the Applicant in claim 1, can not teach automatic transfer of the time sensitive data for automatic display.

Moreover, the *Tsukakoshi* reference fails to teach or disclose automatic display of the time sensitive data subsequent to automatic transfer thereof, as claimed in claim 1. For displaying the transferred data, the transferred data must be accessed at the receiving end processing unit. To this end, a physical separation is required between the sending and receiving end processing units. That is, the receiving end processing unit does not become active until it is physically removed from the sending end processing unit.

For example, once activated after the separation, then only the CPU 11 can access the downloaded personal information. In the *Tsukakoshi* reference, i.e., a physical intervention is required by a user to remove the PC card 100 from the host machine 200. In fact, the second processing unit can only access the downloaded personal information for display on the LCD panel 16 after it is disconnected from the first processing unit. See column 6, lines 5-10. Based on these reasons alone, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is absent. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the § 103 rejection of claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, which stands rejected under §103(a) over *Tsukakoshi*, includes that the time sensitive data is automatically transferred from the storage coupled to the first processor-based system when it is determined that the first processor-based system is being powered off. Without this limitation, at least for the reasons set forth above, claim 2 is in condition for allowance over the cited references. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider all the pending claims.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 03/05/03



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Sanjeev K. Singh under 37 C.F.R. § 10.9(b)  
Registration No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024  
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]  
(713) 468-8883 [Fax ]